

By conservative estimates, they say that business costs of regulatory compliance are about \$430 billion a year. If you add the cost of regulatory compliance of States and local governments, it is about \$900 billion a year.

To put that in perspective, Mr. President, the income tax brings in just under \$800 billion a year. So as you are getting ready on April 15 to send your tax bill in, when you sign that tax bill, you should remember that what you are giving to the Federal Government is less than the stealth tax of regulatory compliance. That is the cost that is holding our business down, from growing and creating the new jobs. So if we are going to free our business to compete, we must take off those regulatory excesses.

Does that mean we are going to stop striving for clean air, clean water, protection of endangered species, safety in the workplace? Heavens no. Of course, not. What we must put in the equation is common sense. We are getting horror stories every day about some silly, stupid thing a regulator does that is unnecessary, that does not help the Government and most certainly hurts business. And it is the business that is the economic engine of America. So if we can stop that regulatory excess, that will be the most important thing we can do to get this economy going once again.

So these are the areas that I think we must address in the second 100 days. These are the areas that I think are going to be very difficult as we go forward. I have heard Democrats in the Chamber here, I have heard Democrats on radio programs talk about starving the children. The people of America are smarter than that. The people of America understand that we are not starving children when we give the States the responsibility for school lunch programs instead of running it from the Federal Government. The people of America are tired of silly, ridiculous statements like that that underestimate their intelligence, because I think the people of America who are raising our children understand that if our children are going to have a future at all, it is only if we begin to act responsibly in getting this huge Federal debt off the backs of those very children.

If they are going to have jobs in their future, if they are going to have education in their future, it is going to be only if we get this economy going again. We cannot do it if we have a program of spend now and pay later. That is what our program has been for the last 30 years in this country, save 1 or 2 years of responsibility.

Mr. President, I think the people of America need to listen very carefully. As we are going home for the next 2 weeks in the Senate, 3 weeks in the House, I hope that the people of America will listen carefully to what their elected representatives are saying because the messages could not be more different. Our message is one of pro-

viding for the future, of trying to make sure that there is a healthy America for our children, of trying to get the 10th amendment back in place, which says the powers not specifically given to the Federal Government will be left to the States and to the people. We must return the 10th amendment and we must let the States do what they know best, which is the needs of their people, rather than somebody in Washington sitting in an office who may not have ever been to Iowa or New Hampshire or Texas or California or Utah deciding what the priorities in that State should be.

My Governor, a Yale graduate, said, "You know, I'm beginning to be a little offended by those people up in Washington. Do they think I'm going to serve potato chips to the children of Texas? Come on. I think the people are smarter than that."

So, Mr. President, I think we have had a very exciting beginning. I think the people of America can say one thing right now and that is: things are changing in Washington. Their voices are being heard.

Is it easy? No. It is going to be very tough. But is it a commitment on our part to do what is right, not necessarily for tomorrow but for the long-term, for 3 years, for 5 years, for 10 years? That is the commitment that the people of America must see and that is what we must talk about as we go home and get the input from our constituents.

I hope that every one of us will take this opportunity to do that, because I think we have had a great beginning. I think the people of America should be assured that things are changing inside the beltway. And, with their support, we are going to keep right on plugging and try to make sure that the small business people of this country are able to grow and create the jobs that will let every American family see a better future for their children.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. CRAIG assumed the chair).

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLICY PROLONGS BOSNIAN HERZEGOVINA WAR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this week marks the third anniversary of the war against Bosnia and Herzegovina. It also marks the third anniversary of the international community's failure in Bosnia—a failure the United States, under both the Bush and Clinton administrations, has participated in.

The biggest mistake made by world leaders was extending, in practice, the

arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina—which is an internationally recognized state and member of the United Nations. In addition to violating Bosnia's fundamental right of self-defense—a right which is recognized in article 51 of the U.N. Charter—this policy has had the effect of prolonging the war. It has prolonged the war by ensuring that the Serbs maintain such a superiority in weapons that they are not compelled to sign any deal—even one which rewards them with half of Bosnia as envisioned by the so-called contact group.

Now, the administration says that this European-designed policy has managed to contain the war and prevented further humanitarian disasters. We should not rush to pat ourselves on the back for our great humanitarianism until we look at the facts.

The facts are that over 200,000 people have been killed over the past 3 years, 17,000 of them children. Hundreds of thousands of civilians have been expelled from their homes because of their ethnicity and religion. Concentration camps, rape, and mass graves have become the tolls of ethnic cleansing—which is just another word for genocide. Homes, churches, and monuments have been reduced to rubble. Putting aside the human factor, from an international legal perspective, the world has watched as a U.N. member state has been attacked and occupied. And, now international leaders want to reward those attackers and occupiers, ostensibly in the pursuit of peace.

Yes, we must give credit to those brave aid workers and U.N. soldiers who have sacrificed and risked their lives to bring food and medicine to those in need. The policy is not their fault; they do not make policy—policy-makers in Washington and European capitals do. Nevertheless, we should not fool ourselves, feeding people who are trapped in U.N. safe havens that are anything but safe, while denying them the means to defend themselves is bad policy.

Yesterday, the Bosnian Prime Minister said in an interview that the Bosnians should prepare for a decade of war. It may sound pessimistic to some, but in my view it's pretty realistic if the present policy continues. Why should Bosnian Serb leaders agree to a settlement? Why should Bosnian Serb forces give up any of the 70 percent of the territory they occupy? Because U.N. forces on the ground? Because of NATO planes that fly overhead but do not bomb?

It is clear that the international community does not have the will to live up to its commitment to protect the Bosnians, so why can't we allow them to protect themselves? The present policy of keeping the U.N. forces in Bosnia indefinitely amounts to occupation. UNPROFOR should be withdrawn and the arms embargo should be lifted. That is the only policy

that makes legal, political, and moral sense. And, it is the only policy that offers any hope of bringing this war to and end by creating a military balance on the ground.

Mr. President, if the cease-fire due to expire on May 1 is not extended and a peace settlement has not been agreed to by the Serbs, I intend to take up the Dole-Lieberman legislation on the Senate floor shortly after the April recess. Three years of monitored genocide is enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

EXTENDING THE APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE OF THE U.S. SENATE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator DOLE, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 109) extending the appreciation and gratitude of the United States Senate to Senator Robert C. Byrd, on the completion by the Senator of the 4 volume treatise entitled "The History of the United States Senate", and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. I would just say I thank the Senator from South Dakota for letting me be a cosponsor. Senator BYRD is certainly a unique figure in the history of this country, let alone the Senate. I extend my congratulations for his continued commitment to the institution as reflected in the four volumes. I certainly congratulate him for his effort.

THE SENATE AND ITS HISTORY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, 206 years ago yesterday—April 6, 1789, U.S. Senate achieved a quorum and got down to business for the first time. This is a fitting occasion to commemorate both the history of the Senate and the Senator who has become the Senate's foremost historian. All of us have heard ROBERT C. BYRD expound upon the history of this institution, about the Constitutional Convention that created it, and about its antecedents, the British Parliament and Roman Senate. In addition, he has regularly applied his historical knowledge to current floor debates. If anyone questions the need for studying history, the senior Senator from West Virginia has offered living proof of its worth.

Those Members new to the Senate and those viewers recently addicted to C-SPAN-II might understandably assume that Senator BYRD spent his early years in the Nation's finest schools pursuing a rich classical education. ROBERT C. BYRD enjoyed none of those early advantages. On Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, shortly

before his first birthday, his mother fell victim to that year's devastating influenza epidemic. Unable to cope alone, his father gave the child to an aunt and uncle who raised him in the hardscrabble coal fields of southern West Virginia. Although he graduated at the head of his high school class, the hardships and poverty of those Depression-era years in the early 1930's made college a luxury about which he could only dream. His early life was one of unrelenting labor, as a grocery clerk, a butcher, and a shipyard welder. In 1946, he won a seat in the West Virginia Legislature, the first step toward a rich and productive career of public service.

Sixteen years after graduating from high school, ROBERT BYRD enrolled in college while serving in the State legislature. Driving great distances between campus and capitol, he managed to complete 70 credit hours of straight-A course work while building an impressive legislative record. In 1952, he won a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. Although without a college degree, he was admitted to law school with the understanding that he maintain at least a B average. In 1963, at age 45, and nearly 5 years into his Senate career, ROBERT BYRD became the first and only person to earn a law degree while serving as a U.S. Senator. Not surprisingly, he earned that degree cum laude.

As he worked his way up the Senate leadership ladder—party secretary, party whip, party floor leader, President pro tempore, Appropriations Committee chairman—he systematically pursued his study of the Senate's rules, precedents, and history; of the American Constitution; of the history of England and of ancient Rome. Blessed with a keen intelligence, a photographic memory, and seemingly limitless energy, he devoured countless volumes by such authors as Plutarch, Tacitus, Montesquieu, Gibbon, Hamilton, Madison, Jefferson, and many more.

Consequently, it should have come as no surprise to his colleagues in the Senate Chamber on a quiet Friday afternoon in March 1980, when he delivered the first in what would become a series of 100 richly textured addresses on the Senate's history and traditions. His speeches appeared serially in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and were later combined into a magnificent four-volume series published by the Government Printing Office. I urge all who hear or read what I say here today to explore these volumes, as I have. Today I would like to take a few minutes to outline their rewarding content.

Senator BYRD's first volume takes the form of a chronological history of the United States from the point of view of the Senate. In it, he describes the events, personalities, and issues that affected the Senate from 1789 to 1989. Here are just a few examples:

He outlines the remarkable achievements of the First Congress, which fleshed out the form of our Federal

Government by establishing the Federal judiciary, adopting the Bill of Rights, and providing sources of revenue.

He demonstrates that conflict between the President and Congress did not begin in the 20th century by recounting the dramatic tale of Andrew Jackson's struggles with the Senate over the Second Bank of the United States. For the only time in its history, the Senate in 1834 actually passed a resolution censuring a Chief Executive, although 3 years later Thomas Hart Benton succeeded in persuading the Senate to expunge that action, thus vindicating the aging Jackson before his presidential term expired.

Senator BYRD relates the story of how Senators came to be elected by direct popular vote after more than a century of being selected by the State legislatures. He traces the flaws in the original process and the efforts made to improve it before a constitutional amendment finally entrusted the citizens of each State with the choice of their Senators. He also describes the later reforms included in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that set the stage for the operation of the Senate we know today.

Unlike most histories of the United States, Senator BYRD views the Nation's great landmark events, like the Civil War, World War I, the Progressive Era, the Great Depression, and World War II, through the eyes of the Senate. He describes the way the body responded to each, showing how the Civil War, for example, stimulated such civilian legislation as the Pacific Railroad Act and the Land-Grant College Act.

Senator BYRD's second volume takes a topical approach to the Senate's history, discussing the way the institution has used its powers to approve treaties, confirm nominations, and conduct impeachment trials. Made up of individual chapters on such topics as Senate leadership, organization, and officers, this book provides essential background on many matters that we still debate today. A chapter on congressional salaries, for example, tells us that the subject has been controversial throughout the Nation's history, with a public outcry forcing Congress to rescind a salary increase on more than one occasion.

The four chapters on extended debate that discuss the development of filibusters and the evolution of the cloture rule offer perspective on the way delaying tactics have been used in Senate debates and the techniques that have been gradually developed to counteract them.

A chapter describing the history of the Senate Chaplain helped us earlier this year when questions arose regarding whether the House and Senate needed their own chaplains. The chapter not only explained the origin of the office but related that in the 1850's the House and the Senate for a time stopped electing official Chaplains and